

## REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 - 14, and newly added claims 15 - 20.

Claims 5, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. By amendment herein, the word "response" has been changed to -reaction--, so as to be consistent with claim 1. This is a clarification, and no change in the scope of the claims is intended.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Payne et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended herein, recites a method for providing one or more alerts over a network. The method comprising the steps of:

composing one or more alert messages, which are sent to an alert database;

using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a user to use in a collaborative manner with other users to respond to the respective alert;

using data extracted from one or more databases, including the alert database, to dispatch the alert messages and corresponding reaction enabling tools to one or more of the users over a

network, the alert messages and corresponding reaction enabling tools that allow contact with facilities useful in responding to the alert.

Thus, the method of claim 1 uses using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a client to use in a collaborative manner with other users to respond to the respective alert. Payne et al. clearly does not teach or suggest this aspect of claim 1.

Payne et al. is directed to a system for making electronic purchases. The network-based sales system of Payne et al. may include at least one buyer computer for operation by a user desiring to buy a product, at least one merchant computer, and at least one payment computer. The buyer computer, the merchant computer, and the payment computer are interconnected by a computer network. The buyer computer is programmed to receive a user request for purchasing a product, and to cause a payment message to be sent to the payment computer that comprises a product identifier identifying the product.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Payne et al. of using network links for gathering a plurality of reaction enabling tools for a client to use in a collaborative manner with other users to respond to an alert, as set forth in claim 1. The method of claim 1 allows a user to bring an extensive range of resources to bear on solving problems, or for obtaining desired information. Payne et al. is directed primarily to providing information via an Internet connection to facilitate making a purchase. No

portion of Payne et al., whether specifically cited by the Examiner or not, teaches or suggests the recitation in claim 1 discussed above. It is thus respectfully submitted that claim 1 is directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining claims (except for claims 19 and 20) depend from independent claim 1. These claims have further recitations, which when combined with the recitations of claim 1, are also directed to patentable subject matter.

With respect to claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10-13, it is noted that the Examiner is relying on the citations for claim 1. However, as note above, none of these citations teach or suggest that users can or should collaborate with other users in making a purchase. Indeed, such collaboration would not make sense in Payne et al. However, in Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 1, such collaboration is highly advantageous in allowing users to work together to solve a difficult problem. In this regard, reference is made to the specification at page 6, lines 8 - 16, where such collaboration is specifically described. Payne et al. is completely silent with respect to this type of approach. Reference is also made to the discussion set forth below for newly added dependent claims 15 and 16.

With specific reference to claim 2, the tool gathering is done by one or more of a manual process and automatic process and the combination of manual and automatic processes. Payne et al. does not teach or suggest claim 2.

Further, Payne et al. does not teach or suggest the contents of alert messages in claim 3, or the events as set forth in claim 4.

With respect to claim 5, Payne et al. does not teach or suggest associating one or more of the response enabling tools to alerts by use of any one more of the recited response enabling tools. Further, Payne et al. does not teach or suggest the list of response enabling tools set forth in claim 6.

Payne et al. does not teach or suggest that one of the databases is a database of client information as set forth in claim 7 or that the response enabling tools are determined by the alert and a combination of the user information, as specifically set forth in claim 8.

With respect to claim 10, Payne et al. does not teach or suggest providing access to otherwise protected service on a temporary basis. Further, Payne et al. does not specifically teach an exclusive service, an access to a web site and an access to privileged information, as set forth in claim 11.

Payne et al. the not teach or suggest that a client includes one more of a website and a person as set forth in claim 12, or that the response tools include any one more of connection to multiple reaction system and connection to a collaborative system, as in claim 13.

Thus, for the reasons set forth above, and for the reasons as set forth with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that claims 2 - 13, are directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 14 recites the method of claim 1, further comprising establishing a community of interest of users in response to said alert. The prior art does not teach or suggest that the users specifically collaborate with one another as set forth in claim 1, from which claim 14 depends. Thus, it is submitted that claim 14 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claim 15 states that the other users are experts in the subject matter of the alert. Newly added claim 16 states that other users include a virtual community having members that can assist in responding to the alert. These claims, which depend from claim 1, and find support in the specification at page 6, lines 8 - 16, are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Payne et al.

Newly added claim 17 adds the additional recitation of providing a message if the user frequently declines to respond to alerts. Support for this claim may be found in the specification at least at page 18, lines 5 - 9, and in the description of Fig. 2h found on page 17. This feature of Applicants' invention advantageously allows for corrective action of various kinds to be taken, such as contacting the user by other means, or sending fewer or no such alerts. It is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claim 18 recites providing identity and entitlement information to the facilities to enable access to the facilities. Support for this claim may be found starting on page 42 of the specification. Payne et al. does not teach or suggest such an approach. Indeed, this would be completely counterproductive in the network-based sales system of Payne et al., as it could have the effect of limiting sales. However, it is advantageous in Applicants' invention, in that the facilities, which may provide complex information or services, are accessed so as to assist the user in solving what may be a difficult problem. Thus, it is submitted that claim 18 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added independent claim 19 is similar to claim 1, but states that the reaction enabling tools are research and computational tools. Support for these recitations may be found throughout the specification, and at least at page 6, lines 8 - 16. While Payne teaches a network-based sales system, there is no teaching or suggestion in Payne et al. of bring together reaction enabling tools to permit research and computation concerning a subject of interest and to enable a reaction to an alert based on such research and calculation. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 20, which depends from claim 19, recites that the research and computational tools are used by the user in collaborative manner with other users. The patentable significance of this recitation was discussed above with

respect to claim 1. It is thus submitted that claim 20 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. A check for \$1,020 to cover the fee for a three month extension of time in which to respond to the office action is enclosed herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker

David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277  
23 Southern Road  
Hartsdale, NY 10530

1/6/2006

Date

Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094